Repeat SARS-CoV-2 Testing Models for Residential College Populations

Joseph Chang[*], Forrest W. Crawford[†], and Edward H. Kaplan[‡]

July 2020

Abstract

Residential colleges are considering re-opening under uncertain futures regarding the COVID-19 pandemic. We consider repeat SARS-CoV-2 testing models for the purpose of containing outbreaks in the residential campus community. The goal of repeat testing is to rapidly detect and isolate new infections as they occur to block transmission that would otherwise occur on campus and, of arguably greater importance, off. The models allow for the evolution of test sensitivity with time from infection, scheduled on-campus resident screening at a given frequency, imported infections from off campus throughout the school year, and a lag from testing until student isolation due to laboratory turnaround and student relocation delay. For early- (late-) transmission of SARS-CoV-2 by age of infection, we find that weekly screening cannot reliably contain outbreaks with reproductive numbers above 1.4 (1.6) if more than one imported exposure per 10,000 students occurs daily. Screening every three days can contain outbreaks providing the reproductive number remains below 1.75 (2.3) if transmission happens earlier (later) with time from infection, but at the cost of greatly increased false positive rates requiring more isolation quarters for students testing positive. Testing frequently while minimizing the delay from testing until isolation for those found positive are the most controllable levers for preventing large residential college outbreaks.

1 Introduction

Universities and colleges around the world, along with other businesses and institutions, have spent the past several months on lockdown on account of the COVID-19 pandemic. Students were sent home, classes and faculty meetings went on-line, and university buildings have remained eerily empty. With stay-at-home restrictions being relaxed if not rescinded, residential universities and colleges are planning to re-open, and perhaps the most prominent decision

[*]Professor of Statistics and Data Science, Department of Statistics and Data Science, Yale University, 24 Hillhouse Avenue, New Haven, CT 06511-6814 Room 211. email: joseph.chang@yale.edu

[†]Associate Professor of Biostatistics, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Management, and Statistics and Data Science, Yale School of Public Health, Department of Biostatistics, PO Box 208034, New Haven, CT, 06510. email: forrest.crawford@yale.edu

[‡]William N. and Marie A. Beach Professor of Operations Research, Professor of Public Health, Professor of Engineering, Yale School of Management, 165 Whitney Avenue, New Haven, CT 06511. email: edward.kaplan@yale.edu

to be made is whether or not to invite students to return in person. Different schools are approaching this issue in different ways. Some colleges feel they have no choice but to allow students to return (Daniels 2020, Jenkins 2020), while others have opted for students to remain off-campus with instruction offered remotely via the internet (Castle 2020, Laframboise 2020). At the heart of this decision is the ability of colleges and universities to keep campuses free from student-driven SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks. While paying attention to the details of infection control and social distancing represent important public health components on campus, increasingly institutions are considering whether testing students for SARS-CoV-2 offers additional protection against the spread of infection (Anderson and Svriuga 2020, Diep and Zahneis 2020, UCSD 2020).

Viral testing for SARS-CoV-2 infections is different than standard diagnostic testing. Usually when a patient is tested for the presence of some medical condition, it leads to a specific set of instructions for the benefit of the patient screened: a change in diet, the prescription of drugs, or a course of more intensive medical treatment such as radiation, chemotherapy, or surgery. With coronavirus, however, the purpose of testing is not to gain access to some treatment. Rather, those who test positive are instructed to isolate to prevent transmitting infection to others. The purpose of repeatedly screening students for SARS-CoV-2 is thus not for the screened patient's individual health, but for the benefit of those who would have been in contact with an infectious person had the detection of an infection not occurred.

It is well-documented that contagious infections such as influenza, mumps, and sexually transmitted diseases spread readily in the residential college context (Bauer-Wolf 2019, Costill and Muoio 2015, Mangan 2019), and there is no reason to expect that SARS-CoV-2 could not be transmitted as well. However, students themselves are not at great medical risk from COVID-19 complications resulting from infection with SARS-CoV-2. Indeed, many if not most students would experience mild to no symptoms of infection at all. However, absent testing, all such infected students would unknowingly pose risks to anyone with whom they are in contact, whether on campus or off. For residential colleges that are themselves isolated geographically, vulnerable workers and faculty (and some students with underlying health conditions to be sure) are the main beneficiaries of repeat student testing. For urban campuses

centrally located within surrounding communities that contain many more vulnerable persons, the main beneficiary of screening students is that community itself. In this sense, beyond protecting the health of vulnerable workers, faculty and students, the main goal of repeatedly screening students on campus is to prevent them from unknowingly igniting transmission chains in the surrounding community.

The way screening programs work to impact the transmission of infection in this context has not been well studied or analyzed. This paper presents a first attempt to do so. We begin with a simple characterization of the early transmission dynamics associated with nascent outbreaks of SARS-CoV-2, and in Section 3 show directly how test frequency, sensitivity and reporting delay directly reduces transmission via isolating those testing positive when test results are obtained. In Section 4 we incorporate this interruption of transmission directly into a dynamic model of an internally generated SARS-CoV-2 outbreak on campus, and we expand the model to include exposures to imported infections from off-campus due to students traveling, wandering about town to restaurants, bars or clubs, or due to visitors. We present the key performance measures by which to assess repeat screening focusing on the cumulative incidence of infection, the number of infections detected, and the number of students placed in isolation for given outbreak and screening scenarios (e.g. different reproductive numbers governing on-campus transmission, different imported exposure rates, different screening frequencies and different test sensitivities). We consider numerous scenarios in Section 5 with a focus on which outbreaks can and cannot be brought under control. We discuss implications of our analysis in Section 6.

2 Age-of-Infection Dependent Transmission

The model employed to analyze repeat screening follows Kaplan (2020a) in presuming that at the beginning of an outbreak, a newly-infected index surrounded by otherwise uninfected students transmits infections according to a time-varying Poisson process with intensity $\lambda(a)$, where a denotes the time from infection of the index (the *age* of infection). The reproductive number denoting the expected number of infections the index will transmit over all time then

equals

$$R_0 = \int_0^\infty \lambda(a)da \tag{1}$$

and as is well-known, an epidemic cannot be self-sustaining unless $R_0 > 1$.

The transmission intensity $\lambda(a)$ can be represented as

$$\lambda(a) = R_0 f(a),\ a > 0 \tag{2}$$

where

$$f(a) = \frac{\lambda(a)}{R_0},\ a > 0 \tag{3}$$

is the probability density function of the forward generation time (Britton and Tomba 2019, Champredon and Dushoff 2015, Wallinga and Lipsitch 2007). This representation separates the strength of transmission (R_0) from the timing of infectiousness (captured by $f(a)$), enabling flexible investigation of both.

Modeling transmission in this form generalizes many epidemic models in commonly used. For example, *S*usceptible-*I*nfectious-*R*ecovered (SIR) models presume constant transmission at rate β during an exponentially distributed infectious period with mean $1/\mu$ (Anderson and May 1991). This can be captured by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{SIR}(a) &= \beta e^{-\mu a} \\ &= \frac{\beta}{\mu} \times \mu e^{-\mu a} \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

with $R_0 = \beta/\mu$ and $f(a) = \mu e^{-\mu a}$. Similarly, modifications of *S*usceptible-*E*xposed-*I*nfectious-*R*ecovered (SEIR) models have been widely applied to model SARS-CoV-2 transmission (Ferguson et al 2020, Kissler et al 2020, Morozova, Li and Crawford 2020). In such models, newly infected but not yet infectious persons enter an exposed state for an exponentially distributed length of time with mean $1/\mu_1$, after which they become infectious for an exponentially distributed duration of mean $1/\mu_2$ during which transmission again occurs at constant rate β. Letting D_1 and D_2 denote the duration of time after infection spent in the exposed and

infectious states, early transmission in this model can be captured by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{SEIR}(a) &= \beta \Pr\{D_1 \leq a < D_1 + D_2\} \\ &= \beta \frac{\mu_1}{\mu_1 - \mu_2}(e^{-\mu_2 a} - e^{-\mu_1 a}) \\ &= \frac{\beta}{\mu_2} \frac{\mu_1 \mu_2}{\mu_1 - \mu_2}(e^{-\mu_2 a} - e^{-\mu_1 a}) \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $R_0 = \beta/\mu_2$ and $f(a) = \frac{\mu_1\mu_2}{\mu_1-\mu_2}(e^{-\mu_2 a} - e^{-\mu_1 a})$.

Beyond SIR and SEIR models, epidemiologists have approximated generation time distributions directly from contact tracing data, and several such studies have been conducted using early SARS-CoV-2 outbreak data from China (see Park et al 2020 for a summary). The generation times are often presumed to follow gamma distributions, as the latter provide a flexible statistical model for the time between the onset of symptoms (the *serial interval*) for infector/infectee pairs within a transmission chain, and the distribution of serial intervals is taken as an estimate of the unobservable times between infections (which is what the generation time density $f(a)$ is meant to represent).

3 Modeling the Impact of Testing and Isolation

Suppose that an infected student is isolated at time T days following infection, having been detected via repeat screening[1]. Figure 1 shows the transmission rate $\lambda(a)$ with the isolation time T represented by the vertical red line. The effect of isolation at T is to erase all infections that would have been transmitted beyond time T; this is illustrated as the shaded blue area in Figure 1.

[1]Isolation would typically last only two weeks, but incorporating this would modify our results only slightly while complicating the analysis; see Kaplan (2020a) for details.



Figure 1: Impact of isolation

The sooner an infectious person is isolated (the smaller the value of T), the greater the number of infections that can be prevented, and the fewer the number of transmissions that escape isolation. Following the Poisson model, conditional on T, the expected number of transmissions that occur before isolation is $\int_0^T \lambda(a)da$. Thus, the expected number of infections that would escape isolation and still be transmitted, R_T, is given by

$$R_T = E\left(\int_0^T \lambda(a)da\right) = E\left(\int_0^\infty \lambda(a)1_{\{T>a\}}da\right) = \int_0^\infty \lambda(a)\Pr\{T > a\}da; \tag{6}$$

here 1_B denotes the indicator function taking the value 1 if the event B occurs and 0 otherwise. Clearly $R_T \leq R_0$ as $\Pr\{T > a\} \leq 1$, with the extent of the reduction in transmission depending on the distribution of T, which in turn depends upon testing characteristics such as the timing of repeat tests, test sensitivity, and the lag time from testing to isolation.

3.1 Perfect Repeat Testing

As a contrast to the regularly-spaced testing that is the subject of most of this paper, consider a perfect test that on average is administered to each student once every τ days but whose timing is otherwise random with a constant hazard rate. This implies that T would follow an exponential distribution with mean τ, with

$$\Pr\{T > t\} = e^{-t/\tau},\ t > 0 \tag{7}$$

as a result. Alternatively, as a model of regularly scheduled testing, suppose that students are administered a perfect test literally once every τ days on a fixed schedule. For example, scheduled weekly testing would require each student to be tested once every seven days. One way to implement this would be for $1/7^{th}$ of the students to be tested each Sunday, a different $1/7^{th}$ each Monday, and so such that all students have the same day (and time slot) for testing each week. For such a schedule in continuous time, T would follow a uniform distribution on $(0, \tau)$, and

$$\Pr\{T > t\} = \max(1 - t/\tau, 0),\ t > 0. \tag{8}$$

From equations (7) and (8), it is clear that scheduled screening would be more effective than random screening for all values of τ since $e^{-t/\tau} > 1 - t/\tau$ for $t > 0$. With random screening, on average a newly infected person would not be detected and isolated until τ time units after infection, whereas with scheduled screening, the mean time from infection to isolation would be just $\tau/2$, while τ would be the *maximum* time from infection until isolation (as opposed to the *mean* time with random screening). This distinction is important, as expanding SIR or SEIR models to include testing by applying a constant testing rate to the infected population amounts to random screening.

3.2 Imperfect Repeat Testing

Tests are not perfect, however. The sensitivity of a test is defined as the conditional probability of receiving a positive test result on an individual, given that the person tested is in fact infected. We denote the sensitivity of a screening test by σ. Random screening with a mean intertest period of τ also results in the time of detection being exponentially distributed, but now with mean τ/σ, inflating the time to detection by the factor $1/\sigma$.

Perfectly scheduled screening is more complicated. Let $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denote the largest integer less than or equal to x (the *floor* function). Perfectly scheduled screening with sensitivity σ yields

$$\Pr\{T > t\} = (1-\sigma)^{\lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor} \left(1 - \sigma \frac{t - \lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor \tau}{\tau}\right) \text{ for } \ t > 0. \tag{9}$$

This follows because in each screening interval of duration τ, detection will occur with probability σ, which makes the number of testing intervals until the interval containing detection

follow a geometric distribution with mean $1/\sigma$. If detection occurs, the timing of detection within the interval will be uniformly distributed between 0 and τ. As a consequence, the expected time from infection to detection with scheduled imperfect screening once every τ days equals

$$\left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - 1\right)\tau + \frac{\tau}{2} = \left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\tau. \tag{10}$$

Note this time is shorter than the mean time to detection with imperfect random screening by $\tau/2$ days, which is the same difference in mean detection times for scheduled versus random screening with perfect testing ($\sigma = 1$).

3.3 Scheduled Screening with Age-of-Infection-Dependent Sensitivity

Given both the shorter lags from infection to isolation and the ease of implementing scheduled versus random testing, we will narrow our focus to scheduled testing while increasing model realism. While we have included test sensitivity in our model, thus far we have presumed constant sensitivity that does not depend on the time since infection. This latter assumption is not realistic. For example, viral tests such as reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) cannot detect infections immediately after they occur, and indeed the ability of a test to detect the virus presumably behaves in a manner that is somewhat related to the ability of an infectious individual to transmit the virus (Kucirka et al 2020). To model the dependence of sensitivity on time since infection, we denote the sensitivity of a test administered at t time units after infection by $\sigma(t)$, where σ is called the *sensitivity function* of the test. For simplicity we assume here that the results of tests taken at different times after infection are mutually independent given the sensitivity function.[2]

Determining the survivor function $\Pr\{T > t\}$ from $\sigma(t)$ is best approached by first deriving the probability density function $g_T(t)$ for the isolation time T. In a scheduled repeat testing policy with screening interval τ, what is the probability that an individual who has been infected for t time units was not detected over the previous $\lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor$ tests administered since becoming infected, but is tested and detected in the time slice $(t, t + dt)$? Owing to the

[2]This independence assumption could be generalized, and in fact the only probabilities the current model would require are of the form $\Pr\{R_t = R_{t+\tau} = \cdots = R_{t+k\tau} = 0\}$ where R_t is the result (1 for positive and 0 for negative) of a test at time t after infection for a given person.

independence of the infection, screening and detection processes, this probability is given by $\frac{dt}{\tau} \times \prod_{k=1}^{\lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor} (1 - \sigma(t - k\tau)) \times \sigma(t)$, where an empty product equals 1 by definition. In other words, the probability density function for the time T from infection until isolation is given by

$$g_T(t) = \frac{\sigma(t)}{\tau} \prod_{k=1}^{\lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor} (1 - \sigma(t - k\tau)) \text{ for } t > 0, \tag{11}$$

and the survivor function $\Pr\{T > t\}$ then follows from integration as

$$\Pr\{T > t\} = \int_{u=t}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma(u)}{\tau} \prod_{k=1}^{\lfloor \frac{t}{\tau} \rfloor} (1 - \sigma(u - k\tau)) du \text{ for } t > 0. \tag{12}$$

3.3.1 Example: Step Function Sensitivity

One simple model of test sensitivity could be described by a *silent window* of duration w after infection during which it is not possible to detect the presence of infection, after which infection can be detected with constant sensitivity σ until time r, the *reach* of the test, beyond which the test becomes insensitive. In this case the test sensitivity would follow a step function over the time from infection, that is

$$\sigma(t) = \sigma 1_{\{w < t < r\}}. \tag{13}$$

The survivor distribution $\Pr\{T > t\}$ is a function of $t \wedge r$, the minimum of t and r, and can be thought of as scheduled screening beginning at time w after infection (for no detection is possible within the window period). Due to the independence of the infection and testing processes, equation (9) still applies, but to the number of days since expiration of the window period rather than to the time of infection, so that the survivor distribution of the time from infection until detection is given by

$$\Pr\{T > t\} = \begin{cases} 1 & t < w \\ (1 - \sigma)^{\lfloor \frac{(t \wedge r) - w}{\tau} \rfloor} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma}{\tau} \left((t \wedge r) - w - \lfloor \frac{(t \wedge r) - w}{\tau} \rfloor \tau\right)\right) & t \geq w. \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

Accounting for the silent window w can substantially reduce the efficiency of repeat testing, as illustrated by the simple result in the case where the test reach r is infinite that the expected

time from infection until detection increases by w days to $\left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - \frac{1}{2}\right)\tau + w$.

3.3.2 Example: Kucirka et al (2020)

An estimated sensitivity function of reverse-transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) tests for SARS-CoV-2 is provided by Kucirka et al. (2020), based on a Bayesian hierarchical model fit to data drawn from 7 previously published studies. Their sensitivity function is approximated by

$$\sigma(t) = \begin{cases} \text{logistic}\left(-29.966 + 37.713\log(t) - 14.452(\log t)^2 + 1.721(\log t)^3\right) & 0 \le t \le 21 \\ \text{logistic}\left(6.878 - 2.436\log(t)\right) & t > 21 \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

where $\text{logistic}(z) = e^z/(1+e^z)$ is the logistic function. This function fits precisely with values obtained by Kucirka et al. (2020) in the range $0 \le t \le 21$, and then the cubic function of $\log(t)$ is extrapolated linearly on the logistic scale for $t > 21$.

3.4 Incorporating Delay From Testing To Isolation

Finally, tests take time to process, as does informing students of their test result and ensuring the start of isolation. We refer to this additional delay as the isolation lag, denoted by ℓ, and note that the impact of incorporating this lag is to shift any 0-lag survivor distribution for the time from infection to isolation by ℓ days to account for the additional delay. Define T_ℓ as the time from infection to isolation incorporating an isolation lag of ℓ, while T_0 is the time from infection until isolation based on whatever screening interval τ or age-of-infection-dependent sensitivity $\sigma(t)$ is being studied in the absence of isolation delay. Our final model for the survivor function for T_ℓ, the time from infection until isolation accounting for the isolation lag, is given by

$$\Pr\{T_\ell > t\} = \begin{cases} 1 & 0 \le t < \ell \\ \Pr\{T_0 > t - \ell\} & t \ge \ell \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

3.5 Illustrative examples

Figure 2 illustrates four examples of sensitivity functions:

1. perfect sensitivity (with no window of zero sensitivity)

2. a step function with sensitivity 0.8 after a window of 2 days with zero sensitivity,

3. the Kucirka et al. sensitivity function

4. a step function having a window of 4 days with zero sensitivity, followed by 10 days with sensitivity 0.6, after which the sensitivity returns to 0 (i.e. reach = 14 days).



Figure 2: Examples of test sensitivity functions

Applying these four tests with regular weekly screening and 1 day of isolation delay in all cases, the corresponding survivor functions are shown in Figure 3. This figure shows how repeat testing is harmed by both imperfect testing (which forces multiple testing cycles to detect new infections), and an isolation lag (which shifts the survivor function one day to the right, increasing the time from detection to isolation).



Figure 3: Probability that the time after infection to isolation exceeds t. Here the isolation delay in all four scenarios was taken to be 1.

Figure 4 plots the transmission function $\lambda(a)$ corresponding to the forward generation time density implied by Li et al (2020), which is a gamma distribution with a mean (standard deviation) of 8.86 (4.02) days, for an outbreak with $R_0 = 1.6$. Also shown are the transmission curves found by multiplying by the three survivor functions of Figure 3.



Figure 4: Transmission curves under different testing scenarios.

The effect of repeat testing on blocking transmission is considerable, but harmed by imperfect sensitivity and isolation delay. One way to see this effect is to compute R_T for each of

these curves following equation (6). Starting with $R_0 = 1.6$ in the absence of any screening, testing students each week with perfect sensitivity would result in $R_T = 0.26$. Replacing perfect screening by a window of 2 days of zero sensitivity followed by sensitivity 0.8 increases R_T to 0.69. Replacing the sensitivity function by that of Kucirka et al (2020) increases R_T to 0.97. The fourth example sensitivity function with lower sensitivity, longer window of zero sensitivity, and finite test reach further increases R_T to 1.11; the effect of the test reach is relatively minor though since it changes the survivor function at times a large enough so that $\lambda(a)$ is relatively small. This shows that weekly screening helps reduce transmission, but is harmed by imperfect test sensitivity in ways that depend on the shape of the sensitivity function.

4 Dynamic Transmission Model

To expand this framework to a dynamic transmission model, we follow Kaplan (2020b) with slightly different notation while incorporating the effect of repeat screening and define:

$s(t) \equiv$ fraction of the population that is susceptible to infection at calendar time t;

$\pi(t) =$ incidence of infection at time t;

$\lambda(a) \equiv$ the transmission intensity as a function of age of infection introduced earlier;

$T =$ the isolation time induced by repeat testing as discussed previously with distribution characterized by the survivor function $\Pr\{T > a\}$

Thinking of time 0 as the start of the term when students arrive to campus, given initial conditions, the dynamic screening model can be written as:

$$\pi(t) = s(t) \int_0^\infty \pi(t-a)\lambda(a) \Pr\{T > a\}\, da, \tag{17}$$

$$\frac{ds(t)}{dt} = -\pi(t) \tag{18}$$

for $t > 0$. Equation (17) sets SARS-CoV-2 incidence proportional to the fraction of the population that is susceptible and the infected population-weighted age-of-infection adjusted transmission intensity thinned by the effect of repeat testing and equation (18) depletes

susceptibles with the incidence of infection. Note that the distribution of infectiousness over time from infection is implicitly accounted for in the definition of $\lambda(a)$, thus there is no need for explicit removal of infectious persons from the population as they simply cease transmitting in accord with $\lambda(a)$.

To specify initial conditions for the model we suppose each student is tested in an initial screening. Letting π_0 denote the fraction of students who were infectious at time 0 but not detected by the initial screening, we assume that their ages of infection at time 0 are uniformly distributed over an interval $[0, A]$, so that $\pi(t) = \pi_0/A$ for $t \in [-A, 0]$. We choose A large enough so that it is a good approximation to consider students at time 0 with infections of age greater than A as no longer infectious. With this assumption there is no need to keep track of when infections of age greater than A at time 0 occurred, but rather it is enough to note their total number as reflected in the initial susceptibility $s(0)$. Thus initial conditions are given by $s(0)$ and π_0.

4.1 Incorporating Imported Infections

Thus far the model has only considered the detection of internally generated infections due to a closed outbreak beginning with the initial conditions $s(0)$ and π_0. However, due to off-campus wanderings as well as visitors to campus, one can expect on-campus residents to be infected by external exposures. A screening policy must contain transmission generated by such imported infections in addition to internal transmission among college residents. Let $v(t)$ denote the exposure rate of imported infections at time t per campus resident. The rate such exposures lead to actual infections presuming on-campus residents are exposed at random then equals $v(t)s(t)$.

For example, if there are n on-campus residents, and on average one such resident has a imported contact sufficient to transmit infection weekly (either by direct off-campus exposure or as the result of exposure to an infected visitor on-campus), then $v(t) = 1/(7n)$ per day. If instead a single sufficient imported exposure happens on a daily basis, then $v(t) = 1/n$ per day. We modify our model by including transmission from imported infections in the on-campus incidence rate, and thus modify equation (17) to

$$\pi(t) = s(t)\left\{\int_0^\infty \pi(t-a)\lambda(a)\Pr\{T > a\}\,da + v(t)\right\}, t > 0. \tag{19}$$

Note the dual role played by $v(t)$: imported infections will contribute to on-campus incidence the same way infections acquired on-campus contribute over time, marking *transmission from* imported infections. But the persons who *acquired* these imported infections immediately deplete the on-campus susceptible population at their time of infection. Both effects are accounted for in equation (19); $v(t)s(t)$ is the instantaneous contribution to incidence by imported exposures at time t, and via equation (18) immediately contribute to the depletion of susceptibles.

4.2 Performance Measures: Cumulative Incidence, Isolation, and Undetected Infections

The cumulative incidence $c(h)$ of infections that occur over some planning horizon h is given by

$$c(h) = \int_0^h \pi(t)dt = s(0) - s(h). \tag{20}$$

Minimizing transmission is the most important goal of a repeat testing program, but it is not the only one. Administrators will also need to have an estimate of the number of students that screening will detect and isolate. Until this point in our discussion, we have focused on detecting actual infections, that is, true positives, but testing also produces false positive errors that will land additional students in isolation. We now consider both in determining the number of students who would require isolation over the planning horizon.

Let $\delta_{TP}(t)$ denote the true positive isolation rate, that is, the rate at which infected students are isolated accounting for scheduled screening frequency, test sensitivity, window and reporting lag at time t from the start of the planning horizon. This isolation rate is given by

$$\delta_{TP}(t) = \int_{a=0}^\infty \pi(t-a)g_T^{(t-a)}(a)\,da \tag{21}$$

where $g_T^{(u)}(a)$ denotes the probability density function for the isolation time T for an infection that occurred at time u. This carries some dependence on u because in our model we assume

that regular screening begins at time 0 so that an individual infected at time $u < 0$ is not tested for the first $|u|$ units of time following infection. The density $g_T^{(u)}(a)$ may be obtained by the general equation (11) applied to a test sensitivity function that has been modified by multiplying it by the indicator function $1_{\{a>|u|\}}$, since we can think of not being tested for the first $|u|$ time units after infection as equivalent to using a test that has sensitivity 0 for the first $|u|$ time units. In our calculations we approximate $\delta_{TP}(t)$ by replacing the infinite upper limit of integration in (21) by A.

To model the false positive isolation rate $\delta_{FP}(t)$, let ϕ denote the false positive rate of the test (which equals one minus the *specificity*). To become a false positive isolated at time t a person needs to be susceptible, tested at time $t - \ell$, and receive a false positive error on the test, which suggests

$$\delta_{FP}(t) = s(t - \ell)\phi/\tau, \tag{22}$$

where ℓ is the isolation lag and τ is the spacing of the regular tests.

Students testing positive thus enter isolation at time t with total rate $\delta(t) = \delta_{TP}(t) + \delta_{FP}(t)$, and remain isolated for duration Δ. The fraction of the population in isolation at time t, $\iota(t)$, when the duration of isolation is equal to Δ (typically 14 days) thus equals

$$\iota(t) = \int_{\max(0,t-\Delta)}^{t} \delta(u)du, \tag{23}$$

with corresponding formulas for true positive and false positive isolations, ι_{TP} and ι_{FP}, in terms of the functions δ_{TP} and δ_{FP}. We assume that false positive detections are not susceptible while in isolation but then they return to the susceptible pool and to regular testing once they leave isolation.

Finally, integrating equation (21) yields the total fraction of the population that was infected and detected over the course of the outbreak. Comparing this result to the cumulative incidence in the population yields the fraction of the population that was infected but not detected.

5 Scenario Analyses and Outbreak Control

The models described throughout this paper have been implemented in a web app available at https://jtwchang.shinyapps.io/testing/. The app allows the user to select values from a wide range of model input parameters as illustrated in Figure 5. The app also allows users to address the timing of transmission as implied by the forward generation time density $f(a)$. We consider two different models for $f(a)$. The first is the gamma distribution implied by Li et al's (2020) study of early transmission dynamics in Wuhan referred to earlier, which is widely cited as the first detailed analysis of early SARS-CoV-2 transmission. The second is also a gamma distribution but with mean (standard deviation) equal to 8.5 (6.1) days; this is based on parameter point estimates in the Bayesian meta-analysis conducted by Park et al (2020). These two forward generation time densities are displayed in Figure 6. Comparing these distributions, we see that while the Park et al and Li et al densities have similar means of 8.9 and 8.5 days, the standard deviation is smaller for the Li density, causing generation times to cluster closer to the mean which implies delayed transmission. The Park et al density rises more steeply and peaks earlier, presenting an early transmission challenge.



Figure 6: Generation time distributions

We illustrate the model with four testing scenarios over an 80 day period simulating an



Figure 5: App implementing the model

abbreviated fall term in a population of 10,000 students with reproductive numbers of 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, and 2.5 using the Li et al (2020) forward generation time distribution. We assume that testing takes place every three days, set $v(t) = 1$ imported exposure per day, test specificity equals 99.8%, and test sensitivity follows the trajectory estimated by Kucirka et al (2020) discussed earlier. The outbreaks begin with three initially infectious students at the start of school (everyone else in the population is susceptible), and a 24 hour delay from testing to student isolation for students testing positive. Figure 7 plots the cumulative number of infections in these four scenarios.



Figure 7: Cumulative infections over time in scenarios with testing every 3 days and fixed infectivity function, sensitivity function, and delays, as R_0 varies.

Cumulative infections increase from 131, to 187, to 312, and then 658 as R_0 increases from 1.0 to 2.5 in increments of 0.5, while the time averaged number of students isolated equals 102, 109, 124, and 162 in these same scenarios. There are about 90 false positives in isolation on average in all four scenarios. The nonlinear effect of R_0 on these otherwise equivalent scenarios is notable. University preparations in the realms of social distancing and infection control are meant to lower R_0, and if students comply with such directives, the likelihood of achieving a favorable epidemic outcome should increase. However, some are skeptical that students will comply with such directives (Steinberg 2020), which could

lead to higher reproductive numbers (and imported exposures) and worse epidemic outcomes, perhaps comparable to cruise ship transmission (Zhang et al 2020).

This model is flexible in allowing users to simulate many different testing scenarios, but it is perhaps most useful in identifying the limits of outbreak control for alternative repeat-testing policies. The proposed approach is to first identify an acceptable control level of infection within a defined time periord, such as 5% of the student population over the course of a semester. Such a control level could reflect the maximum number of infections university health systems can handle considering realistic testing (both collection and laboratory resources), isolation capacity (residential space, human resources for monitoring, counseling and compliance). The control level could also reflect university concern with secondary transmission from students to vulnerable persons such as certain faculty, workers, or the residents of the surrounding community in which the university is embedded. The control level could even follow from a mortality goal such as ensuring the probability of zero COVID-19 fatalities is at least 99%.

For a given repeat testing interval, one can use the app to determine the most challenging parameter values for which total infections remain within the previously stated control level. Repeating this for different testing frequencies thus helps determine the limits of control for each policy. While identifying appropriate control limits is the responsibility of university leadership as opposed to analysts, having the ability to show officials the limits of different control strategies enables senior decision makers to trade off infection outcomes against other important considerations including testing costs as well as intangibles such as the importance and value of residential education in the midst of a pandemic.

We illustrate by again considering a scenario where 10,000 students will be repeatedly tested over 80 days. We maintain the assumptions that there is one imported exposure per day, test specificity equals 99.8%, there are three initially infectious students, and a 24 hour delay from testing to student isolation. There are four transmission and detection scenarios considered, corresponding to using the late-transmission Li et al (2020) or early-transmission Park et al (2020) forward generation time density with either the Kucirka et al (2020) or step-function sensitivity, where the step-function presumes a two day non-detection window followed by constant 80% sensitivity. For weekly screening and testing every three days,

we determine the largest value of R_0 (in increments of 0.05) such that total infections are held beneath 500 (or 5% of the population tested), and report total infections, average and maximum daily numbers of students isolated, and average daily positive tests.

Table 1 reports the maximal values of R_0 for weekly screening that can keep infections below 5% of the population. The most pessimistic scenario -- early transmission and Kucirka et al (2020) sensitivity -- requires that R_0 falls at 1.4 or below. The most optimistic scenario -- late transmission and the presumed step-function sensitivity -- keeps infections below 5% providing R_0 falls below 2.25. The two intermediate scenarios contain infections below 5% of the population providing R_0 is at most 1.6-1.8. While all four of these scenarios result in comparable numbers of infections and daily positive tests, note that both scenarios employing the step-function sensitivty on average isolate more students than the remaining scenarios. This is because of the high 80% test sensitivity that applies once the two-day non-detection window expires in the step-function scenarios. A greater number of infected students are detected as a consequence, leading to the larger number of students in isolation. CDC (2020) recommends considering R_0 to fall in the range from 2 to 3 in modeling studies, with 2.5 serving as their recommended base case value. Our analysis suggests that weekly testing could not contain infections below 5% for CDC's base case reproductive number. However, the CDC recommendations are not specifically for residential college outbreaks, where one would hope that social distancing and infection control protocols would result in milder outbreaks with lower values of R_0. On the other hand, conservative planning principles would suggest that hope is not enough, especially given recent evidence regarding outbreaks already occurring at residential colleges (Ellis 2020; Fields 2020). The wide range of results reported in Table 1 suggests that while weekly screening could contain an otherwise large-scale outbreak under favorable conditions of late transmission and (relatively) early detection with 80% test sensitivity, overall weekly screening is not sufficiently robust to reliably contain outbreaks in the residential college setting.

Scenario ($f(a)$, $\sigma(a)$)	Maximal R_0	Infections	Average Isolated	Maximum Isolated	Positive Tests/day
Li et al. Kucirka	1.6	472	87	152	7
Li et al. step-function	2.25	465	93	155	8
Park et al. Kucirka	1.4	447	87	139	7
Park et al. step-function	1.8	456	99	156	8

Table 1: Weekly Screening Results

Table 2 reports results for testing once every three days. The worst case scenario combining early transmission with Kucirka et al (2020) sensitivity can now contain outbreaks for any reproductive number lower than 1.75, while the optimistic scenario combining late transmission with step-function sensitivity could contain outbreaks with R_0 as large as 4.8. The intermediate scenarios can keep infections below 5% of the population for reproductive numbers as large as 2.3-2.65. Of course, compared to weekly screening, the number of students isolated increases greatly due to the inevitable increase in false positives associated with more frequent testing. Testing students every three days is thus more robust than weekly screening in that the range of reproductive numbers for which infections can be kept below 5% is larger for all scenarios. Such improved performance comes at the expense of isolating many more students over the semester, in addition to the cost of the increased number of tests required.

Scenario ($f(a)$, $\sigma(a)$)	Maximal R_0	Infections	Average Isolated	Maximum Isolated	Positive Tests/day
Li et al. Kucirka	2.3	474	143	207	11
Li et al. step-function	4.8	491	150	206	12
Park et al. Kucirka	1.75	459	143	194	11
Park et al. step-function	2.65	499	153	197	12

Table 2: Testing Every Three Days

These examples illustrate an obvious general point, which is that other things being equal, more frequent screening leads to better infection control. The examples also indicate that it is more difficult to contain scenarios where transmission occurs earlier (as with the Park et al (2020) generation time distribution) rather than later (as with Li et al (2020)) after infection. Other factors that make control more difficult include the rate of imported exposures. Both of the examples above presumed a single daily imported exposure over the modeled outbreaks; increasing this rate would make matters much worse. Also, if the delay from testing until the isolation of those found infected increases, the situation becomes much worse. For example, consider the Li et al (2020) / Kucirka et al (2020) scenario when testing every 3 days. If the delay from testing to isolation increased from 24 to 48 hours, the maximal R_0 at which infections could be kept below 500 would drop from 2.3 to 1.9; adding one more day to increase the delay to 72 hours would force the maximal controllable R_0 to 1.65. This shows that two additional days of post-test delay would render testing once every three days no more effective than weekly testing with only one day of delay.

6 Discussion

With much of the world only now emerging from COVID-19 lockdowns, educational institutions are struggling with a fundamental question: absent a vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 or an effective treatment for COVID-19, is it safe to bring residential students back to campus? Presuming infections can enter the student population, and recognizing that many if not most such infections will be asymptomatic, the ability to detect and isolate infections as they occur is crucial to prevent large outbreaks among students on campus and ignited by students off campus. This article has shown how repeat testing interrupts transmission via the isolation of infectious students, and analyzed numerous transmission scenarios. Testing itself is not a panacea; it is the isolation of infectious students that prevents transmission, and should isolation not follow the detection of infected students, repeat screening would be relegated to producing descriptive outbreak statistics rather than actively stopping outbreaks from happening. Delay from testing until isolation further exacerbates the infection control benefits that frequent repeat testing can bring. Even if students are tested once every three days, there are plausible transmission scenarios where 5% or more of a student population could become infected over the course of an abbreviated 80 day semseter.

This analysis suggests that administrators must proceed cautiously and with open eyes when designing residential college screening programs, for while repeat testing for SARS-CoV-2 infection can be a powerful tool for preventing infections and preserving public health in the residential college setting, it is not guaranteed to succeed. Unlike engineering systems that are built conservatively to withstand multiple failures, the repeat testing system is necessarily fragile in that to succeed, all of the system components must work. Students must comply with infection control, social distancing, test scheduling and (if testing positive) isolation requirements for the repeat testing system to work effectively. The tests themselves must perform at or above expectation in terms of their ability to detect infected students. Isolation delay, including laboratory turnaround time, should be minimized to get the best possible results. While many of the factors involved are beyond control, college administrators should be able to implement systems that minimize isolation delay by both contracting with testing laboratories to guarantee acceptable test turnaround times, and putting in place efficient

communications and support mechanisms so that students who do test positive can be isolated as quickly as possible. Colleges can also effectively inform students what behaviors will be expected of them on campus while also pointing out the penalities of failing to comply with the adopted behavioral code. Finally, if a repeat testing and isolation program begins to lose control and infections are detected at higher rates than anticipated, colleges can always shut down and confine students to quarters while ensuring that all those in need of medical attention receive it. The whole point of repeat screening is to avoid such an outcome, but nonetheless university administrators must be ready to close their residential colleges should repeat testing fail to contain the spread of SARS-CoV-2 on campus.

References

[1] Anderson N, Svriuga S (2020) Colleges push viral testing, other ideas for reopening in fall. But some worry about deepening the health crisis. Washington Post https://tinyurl.com/y8r2o6sy (accessed June 13, 2020)

[2] Anderson RM, May RM (1991) Infectious diseases of humans: Dynamics and control. Oxford University Press, Oxford

[3] Bauer-Wolf J (2019) Mumps outbreak at Temple University. Inside Higher-Ed https://tinyurl.com/yaha2vz8 (accessed June 13, 2020)

[4] Britton T, Tomba GS (2019) Estimation in emerging epidemics: Biases and remedies. J R Soc Interface 16:20180670. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2018.0670 (accessed April 15, 2020)

[5] Castle S (2020) Cambridge University will hold its lectures online next year. https://tinyurl.com/yax8k4ou (accessed June 3, 2020)

[6] CDC (2020). COVID-19 Pandemic Planning Scenarios. United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/planning-scenarios.html (accessed June 20, 2020)

[7] Champredon D, Dushoff J (2015) Intrinsic and realized generation intervals in infectious-disease transmission. Proc. R. Soc. B 282: 20152026. http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.2026 (accessed May 28, 2020)

[8] Costill D, Muoio D (2015) College campus outbreaks require timely, effective public health measures. Infectious Disease News https://tinyurl.com/y79ggfan (accessed June 13, 2020)

[9] Daniels M (2020) Why failing to reopen Purdue University this fall would be an unacceptable breach of duty. Washington Post https://tinyurl.com/yblsjth3 (accessed June 6, 2020)

[10] Diep F and Zahneis M (2020) Welcome to the socially distanced campus. Chronicle of Higher Education https://www.chronicle.com/article/Welcome-to-the-Socially/248850 (accessed June 6, 2020)

[11] Ellis L (2020) At One Flagship, Coronavirus Cases Surge Even in the Midst of Summer. Chronicle of Higher Education https://www.chronicle.com/article/At-One-Flagship-Coronavirus/249054 (accessed July 3, 2020)

[12] Ferguson N, Laydon D, Gemma N-G et al (2020). Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID-19 mortality and healthcare demand. Imperial College COVID-19 Response Team, March 16, 2020, https://tinyurl.com/tcdy42y (accessed April 11, 2020)

[13] Fields A (2020) At least 80 UW students in fraternities test positive for coronavirus, a foreboding sign for college reopenings. Seattle Times https://tinyurl.com/y77epskr (accessed July 3, 2020)

[14] Hanson KE, Caliendo AM, Arias CA, Englund JA, Lee MJ, Loe M, Patel R, El Alayli, Kalot MA, Falck-Ytter Y, Lavergne V, Morgan RL, Murad MH, Sultan S, Bhimraj A, Mustafa RA (2020) Infectious Diseases Society of America Guidelines on the Diagnosis of COVID-19. http://www.idsociety.org/COVID19guidelines/dx (accessed June 3, 2020)

[15] Jenkins JI (2020) We're reopening Notre Dame. It's worth the risk. New York Times https://tinyurl.com/y7vmz3mp (accessed June 3, 2020)

[16] Kaplan EH (2020a) Containing 2019-nCoV (Wuhan) coronavirus. Health Care Manag Sci https://doi.org/10.1007/s10729-020-09504-6 (accessed May 9, 2020)

[17] Kaplan, EH (2020b) COVID-19 Scratch Models to Support Local Decisions. Manufacturing and Services Operations Management https://doi.org/10.1287/msom.2020.0891 (accessed July 8, 2020).

[18] Kissler S, Tedijanto C, Lipsitch M, Grad YH (2020). Social distancing strategies for curbing the COVID-19 epidemic. Harvard School of Public Health, March 2020 http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:42638988 (accessed April 11, 2020)

[19] Kucirka LM, Lauer SA, Laeyendecker O, Boon D, Lessler J (2020) Variation in false-negative rate of reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction–based SARS-CoV-2 tests by time since exposure. Annals of Internal Medicine https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/10.7326/M20-1495 (accessed June 13, 2020)

[20] Laframboise K (2020) McGill University looks to take fall semester online amid coronavirus pandemic. https://tinyurl.com/ybkae6w3 (accessed June 2, 2020)

[21] Li Q, Guan X, Wu P et al (2020b) Early transmission dynamics in Wuhan, China, of novel coronavirus-infected pneumonia. N Engl J Med. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001316 (accessed April 15, 2020)

[22] Mangan K (2019) Colleges face swine-flu challenge as number of sick students surges. Chronicle of Higher Education https://tinyurl.com/ybprqdqw (accessed June 13, 2020)

[23] Morozova O, Li ZR, Crawford FW (2020) A model for COVID-19 transmission in Connecticut. https://tinyurl.com/ydyh623m (accessed June 13, 2020)

[24] Park SW, Bolker BM, Champredon D, Earn DJD, Li M, Weitz JS, Grenfell BT, Dushoff J. (2020) Reconciling early-outbreak estimates of the basic reproductive number and its uncertainty: framework and applications to the novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) outbreak. https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.01.30.20019877v4.full.pdf (accessed June 4, 2020)

[25] Steinberg L. (2020) Expecting students to play it safe if colleges reopen is a fantasy. New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/15/opinion/coronavirus-college-safe.html (accessed June 29, 2020)

[26] UCSD (2020) Return to Learn Program. University of California San Diego, https://coronavirus.ucsd.edu/return-to-learn/index.html (accessed Jun 13, 2020)

[27] Wallinga J, Lipsitch M (2007) How generation intervals shape the relationship between growth rates and reproductive numbers. Proc. R. Soc. B:274, 599–604. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2006.3754 (accessed May 29, 2020)

[28] Zhang S, Diao MY, Yu W, Pei L, Lin Z, Che D (2020) Estimation of the reproductive number of novel coronavirus (COVID-19) and the probable outbreak size on the Diamond Princess cruise ship: A data-driven analysis. International Journal of Infectious Diseases 93:201-204, https://tinyurl.com/ybt5vmux (accessed July 13, 2020)